

Sage Legal LLC

18211 Jamaica Avenue • Jamaica, NY 11423-2327 • (718) 412-2421 • emanuel@sagelegal.nyc

June 18, 2025

VIA ECF

United States District Court
District of New Jersey
Attn: Hon. Elizabeth A. Pascal, U.S.M.J.
4th & Cooper Streets
Courtroom 5C
Camden, NJ 08101

Re: Sinowa Johnson v. NJ Transit Bus Operations Inc., et al.
Case No.: 1:25-cv-2528 (KMW) (EAP)

Dear Judge Pascal:

This firm represents Plaintiff Sinowa Johnson (hereinafter the “Plaintiff”) in the above-referenced case.

Plaintiff writes to regrettably inform this Court that Defendants have abjectly refused to cooperate in the preparation of a joint proposed discovery plan based on the ill-conceived notion that discovery should be stayed until a decision on their motion to dismiss is rendered despite the fact that Defendants did not seek a stay of discovery and the filing of a motion to dismiss, by itself, does not stay discovery. See Udeen v. Subaru of America, Inc., 378 F. Supp. 3d 330, 332 (D.N.J. 2019) (holding that the mere filing of a motion to dismiss does not stay discovery) (citation omitted).

Defendants have not sought a stay of discovery and no stay is in effect. Thus, this letter is submitted in accordance with § 8 of this Court’s judicial preferences to inform the Court that Plaintiff met-and-conferred virtually with the Defendants for approximately twenty (20) minutes in an attempt to resolve the dispute. Defendants insisted that discovery should begin thirty (30) days after this Court issues a decision on their pending¹ motion to dismiss. Plaintiff offered to choose actual dates further out after explaining that there is no stay and Plaintiff does not agree to a stay, but Defendants refused to provide a date despite no less than five or six (5-6) repeated requests to choose dates so that the parties may submit a joint proposed discovery plan.

As a result, and in an effort to avoid wasting judicial resources, Plaintiff respectfully submits that the attached proposed scheduling Order submitted unilaterally by her should control discovery in this case going forward due to the Defendants’ unreasonable refusal to cooperate in discovery based on the meritless notion that a stay should be in place when no such stay was requested.

Plaintiff thanks this honorable Court for its time and attention to this case.

¹ Defendants recently consented to a thirty (30) day extension of time for Plaintiff to respond to this motion, and Plaintiff shall make a separate application – to the extent required beyond the instant request here – for an extension of time of that deadline.

Hon. Elizabeth A. Pascal, U.S.M.J.
United States District Court
District of New Jersey
June 18, 2025
Page | 2

April 9, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

SAGE LEGAL LLC

/s/ Emanuel Kataev, Esq.
Emanuel Kataev, Esq.
18211 Jamaica Avenue
Jamaica, NY 11423-2327
(718) 412-2421 (office)
(917) 807-7819 (cellular)
(718) 489-4155 (facsimile)
emanuel@sagelegal.nyc

*Attorneys for Plaintiff
Sinowa Johnson*

VIA ECF

CRUSER, MITCHELL, NOVITZ, SANCHEZ, GASTON, & ZIMET, LLP
Attn: Douglas V. Sanchez, Esq.
50 Tice Boulevard, Suite 250
Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey 07677
(201) 474-7100
dsanchez@cmlawfirm.com

*Attorneys for Defendant
NJ Transit Bus Operations Inc.*

COHEN, LEDER, MONTALBANO & CONNAUGHTON, LLC
Attn: Paul A. Montalbano
669 River Drive, Suite 125
Elmwood Park, New Jersey 07407
(908) 298-8800
montalbanoemail@yahoo.com

*Attorneys for Defendant
ATU Local 880*